

Message Text

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04499 01 OF 03 301548 Z

40

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-13 ADP-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

INRE-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-02 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10

PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11 ACDA-19 OMB-01 AECE-00 RSR-01

/142 W

----- 077545

O P 301425 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 9042

INFO SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

MBFR CAPTALS PRIORITY 521

USMISSION GENEVA PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

USDOCOSOUTH PRIORITY

USDEL SALT TWO

AMEMBASSY BELGRADE

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 3 VIENNA 4499

DISTO

USNATO TAKE AS IMMEDIATE

FROM US REP MBFR

E. O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: MBFR: DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET AND CZECHOSLOVAK REPS,
MAY 29, 1973

1. BEGIN SUMMARY. UK AND US REPS MET FOR DISCUSSION OF COMMUNIQUE
TEXT WITH SOVIET AND CZECHOSLOVAK REPS AFTERNOON OF MAY 29.
SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04499 01 OF 03 301548 Z

DISCUSSION FOCUSED ON EFFORTS TO RECONCILE ALLIED DRAFT TEXT
OF MAY 27 AND SOVIET TEXT OF MAY 29. SPEED WITH WHICH EAST
PRODUCED COUNTER- DRAFT TO ALLIED TEXT OF MAY 27 AND CONSTRUC-
TIVE ATTITUDE OF EASTERN REPS DURING SESSION WITH UK AND US REPS

EVIDENCED EASTERN WILLINGNESS TO REACH RAPID AGREEMENT ON COMMUNIQUE TEXT. NONETHELESS, FOUR IMPORTANT QUESTIONS REMAIN OPEN: THE DATE OF NEGOTIATIONS; USE OF THE TERM "BALANCED"; LANGUAGE REFLECTING THE CONCEPT OF PHASES OR STAGES; AND TO A LESSER EXTENT, THE ISSUE OF WHETHER THE CAPACITY TO INTRODUCE TOPICS FOR NEGOTIATION AS DISTINGUISHED FROM DISCUSSION SHOULD BE EXPLICITLY RESTRICTED TO DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. A FURTHER WORKING SESSION WITH SAME PARTICIPANTS WILL BE HELD ON AFTERNOON OF MAY 30. END SUMMARY.

2. UK REP OPENED DISCUSSION, IN WHICH SOVIET REPS KHLESTOV, MOVCHAN AND TIMERBAYEV AND CZECHOSLOVAK REPS LAHODA AND KLEIN PARTICIPATED FOR EAST, BY SAYING THAT DISCUSSION OF COMMUNIQUE HAD DEVELOPED IN A CONSTRUCTIVE WAY, INCLUDING EASTERN TABLING OF A DRAFT TEXT EARLIER ON SAME DAY. THE RESULT HOWEVER WAS THAT THERE WERE TWO TEXTS OF EQUAL VALUE ON THE TABLE. IN ORDER TO SAVE FRUITLESS COMPETITION BETWEEN THE TEXTS, A NORMAL PRACTICE IN CASES OF THIS KIND WAS TO GIVE EQUAL STATUS TO BOTH AND SEEK TO FIND A COMMON LANGUAGE TO BE RECORDED ON A SEPARATE SHEET. INSTEAD OF THE EXPECTED PROCEDURAL OBJECTIONS, KHLESTOV AGREED IMMEDIATELY TO THIS SUGGESTED PROCEDURE.

3. IN DISCUSSION OF PARAGRAPH 1, ALLIED REPS ARGUED THAT IT WAS ILLOGICAL TO CITE IN THE FIRST PARAGRAPH AN AGREED DESIGNATION FOR THE NEGOTIATIONS WHICH IN FACT HAD ONLY BEEN AGREED AT THE END OF THE CONSULTATIONS, SINCE TO DO SO WOULD DISTORT THE FACT THAT AGREEMENT ON THIS FORMULA WAS ONE OF THE MAIN END PRODUCTS OF THE CONSULTATIONS. THEY SUGGESTED THAT THE FIRST SENTENCE MIGHT MENTION "NEGOTIATIONS RELATING TO ARMED FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE" WHICH WOULD NOT HAVE SUCH AN EFFECT. AFTER DISCUSSION, IT WAS AGREED TO USE LANGUAGE FROM THE RECORD OF THE MAY 14 PLENARY MEETING AS FOLLOWS: "PREPARATORY CONSULTATIONS RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE TOOK PLACE IN VIENNA FROM JANUARY 31, 1973 TO (BLANK), 1973." SOVIET REPS SAID THEY DID NOT THINK IT NECESSARY TO APPEND THE RECORD OF MAY 14 SINCE IT HAD BEEN PUBLISHED. ALLIED REPS, WHILE STATING THEY CONSIDERED THE ISSUE A MINOR ONE, SAID THE RECORD HAD NEVER PUBLISHED IN COMMON AND SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04499 01 OF 03 301548 Z

THAT IT MIGHT BE ADVISABLE TO GIVE IT COMMON STATUS THROUGH APPENDING IT TO THE COMMUNIQUE. IT WAS AGREED TO CONSIDER THE MATTER FURTHER (FOOTNOTE 1. OF WORKING TEXT).

4. UK REP SAID ALLIES WOULD ACCEPT FIRST SENTENCE OF SOVIET DRAFT MINUS DESIGNATION FOR THE NEGOTIATIONS, TO WHICH HE WOULD RETURN, SINCE FIRST SENTENCE WAS IDENTICAL TO ALLIED DRAFT. REGARDING THE DATE, HE SAID THE ALLIES AGREED THAT THE TALKS SHOULD TAKE PLACE NO LATER THAN OCTOBER 30, 1973 AND ASKED FOR SOVIET POSITION. AFTER CONSIDERABLE FUMBLING AROUND AND INTERNAL DISCUSSION IN EASTERN DELEGATIONS, KHLESTOV SAID THE SITUATION WAS SUCH THAT IT HAD BEEN DECIDED TO DISCUSS IN THE FORM OF A

DRAFT COMMUNIQUE THOSE PARTS DEALING WITH AN AGENDA. IT WAS
MANIFEST THAT THE FINAL COMMUNIQUE SHOULD CONTAIN SPECIFICATION
OF TIME AND PLACE BUT HE WAS NOT READY TO DISCUSS THESE POINTS
UNTIL AFTER AGREEMENT HAD BEEN REACHED ON THE REMAINDER OF THE
COMMUNIQUE. ALLIED REPS SAID THAT THERE HAD BEEN NO GENERAL
AGREEMENT TO THIS PROCEDURE. THEY WISHED TO POINT OUT THAT
THE SOVIETS HAD ASSUMED AN OBLIGATION TO HOLD THE NEGOTIA-
TIONS NO

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04499 02 OF 03 301551 Z

40

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-13 ADP-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

USIA-12 INRE-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-02 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 NEA-10

GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11 ACDA-19 OMB-01

AECE-00 RSR-01 /154 W

----- 077569

O P 301425 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 9043

INFO SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

MBFR CAPITALS PRIORITY 522

AMEMBASSY BELGRADE

USMISSION GENEVA PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USLOSACLANT PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

USDOCOSOUTH PRIORITY

USDEL SALT TWO II PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 3 VIENNA 4499

GENEVA FOR DISTO

FROM US REP MBFR

USNATO TAKE AS IMMEDIATE

REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES." KHLESTOV ASKED WHAT HAD HAPPENED
TO THE WORD " ARMAMENTS." THE US REP SAID THIS WAS UNDERSTOOD
UNDER THE TERM " FORCES," AND THAT IT WOULD BE SUPERFLUOUS
TO SPECIFY IT INDEPENDENTLY. SOVIET REP MOVCHAN SAID IT WOULD
BE MUCH BETTER IF " REDUCTIONS" CAME FIRST IN THE PHRASE. ONE
MIGHT THEN PERHAPS MAKE SOME REFERENCE TO " RELATED MEASURES."
ALLIED REPS SAID " ASSOCIATED MEASURES" WOULD BE PREFERABLE

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04499 02 OF 03 301551 Z

TO " RELATED MEASURES."

9. THERE WAS FURTHER LENGTHY DISCUSSION OF THESE PROPOSALS, WITH SOVIETS CLAIMING THAT THEY WOULD CONSIDER THE FORMULA BUT COULD NOT TAKE ANY POSITION AT THIS TIME. ALLIED REPS SAID THEY COULD NOT CONTINUE WITH REMAINDER OF TEXT UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES. UK REP SAID THAT DISCUSSION OF THE FORMULA WAS GETTING SO COMPLICATED THAT HE WOULD PROPOSE, IN ORDER TO SIMPLIFY THE SITUATION, THE USE OF THE PHRASE " ARMED FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE." SOVIET REPS INDICATED THAT THEY DID NOT FIND THIS IDEA ATTRACTIVE. EASTERN REPS THEN WITHDREW FOR A CONFERENCE IN A NEIGHBORING ROOM. WHEN THEY RETURNED, THEY SAID THEY WOULD BE WILLING TO ACCEPT THE ALLIED FORMULA, BUT ONLY IF THE WORD " ARMAMENTS" WAS INCLUDED. OTHERWISE, THEY WOULD HOLD TO THEIR ORIGINAL FORMULA. AFTER FURTHER DISCUSSION, TENTATIVE AGREEMENT WAS REACHED ON THE PHRASE " MUTUAL REDUCTION OF FORCES AND ARMAMENTS AND ASSOCIATED MEASURES IN CENTRAL EUROPE," THE SOVIETS HAVING IN THE INTERVAL DROPPED THEIR INSISTENCE ON THE WORDS " STRATEGIC" AND " AREA." SOVIET REPS CAUTIONED THAT THEY COULD ONLY ACCEPT THE PHRASE ON AN INFORMAL, AD REFERENDUM BASIS.

10. ALLIED REPS SAID THEY WOULD BE PREPARED ON THIS BASIS TO CONTINUE TO GO THROUGH THE REMAINDER OF THE TEXT. THEY SAID THAT IN VIEW OF THE FACT THAT THERE WERE CONFLICTING VERSIONS OF THE THIRD AND FOURTH PARAGRAPHS, IT WOULD BE BEST TO GO THROUGH THE REMAINDER OF BOTH TEXTS CONSIDERING IN TURN ONE SUCCESSIVE SENTENCE FROM EACH PARA OF THE TEXT. THE ORDER WOULD BE DISCUSSED LATER. SOVIETS AGREED TO THIS PROCEDURE.

11. ALLIED REPS SAID REGARDING FIRST SENTENCE OF SOVIET DRAFT OF PARA 3, " THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE CONSULTATIONS HAD A FRUITFUL AND CONSTRUCTIVE EXCHANGE OF VIEWS ON THE AGENDA FOR THE FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS AND AS A RESULT AGREED THAT THE NEGOTIATIONS WOULD FOCUS ON, ETC." ALLIED REPS SAID IT WAS AN EXAGGERATION TO CALL THE DISCUSSION OF THE AGENDA FRUITFUL. THEY WOULD BE WILLING TO CALL IT " USEFUL." IT WOULD IMPLY AGREEMENT ON AN AGENDA IF THE PHRASE " AS A RESULT" WERE USED AND THIS SHOULD BE DROPPED AND THE SENTENCE ENDED AT THAT POINT. ALLIED REPS SAID THE SENTENCE SHOULD SPEAK OF AN EXCHANGE OF VIEWS ON " AN AGENDA" RATHER THAN " THE AGENDA" BECAUSE THERE
SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04499 02 OF 03 301551 Z

HAD BEEN NO AGREEMENT ON A SPECIFIC AGENDA. AFTER DISCUSSION, SOVIET REPS AGREED THAT THE SENTENCE SHOULD READ, " THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE CONSULTATIONS HAD A USEFUL AND CONSTRUCTIVE EXCHANGE OF VIEWS ON AN AGENDA FOR THE FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS."

12. ALLIED REPS THEN TURNED TO THE SENTENCE IN THE ALLIED

DRAFT OF PARA 2 WHICH STATES, " IT WAS AGREED THAT THE GENERAL OBJECTIVE OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS WILL BE PROGRESSIVELY TO ACHIEVE A MORE STABLE RELATIONSHIP IN EUROPE, ETC." ALLIED REPS SAID THAT NOW THAN AN APPARENTLY SATISFACTORY DESIGNATION FOR THE NEGOTIATIONS HAD BEEN TENTATIVELY AGREED ON, THERE WAS NO LONGER SO GREAT A NEED FOR THEIR PROPOSED PHRASE, " THROUGH APPROPRIATE AGREEMENTS AND MEASURES CONCERNING THE ACTIVITIES AND REDUCTIONS OF ARMED FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE." HOWEVER, THEY DID NOT LIKE THE PHRASES " FURTHER DETENTE" AND " ON THE EUROPEAN CONTINENT" IN THE SOVIET PROPOSAL WHICH WAS OTHERWISE SIMILAR TO THE ALLIED LANGUAGE. FURTHERMORE, THE WORD " PROGRESSIVELY" SHOULD BE USED. THE SOVIET REP SAID THEY WOULD BE WILLING TO DELETE THE REFERENCE TO " FURTHER DETENTE" AND TO SAY " IN EUROPE" INSTEAD OF " ON THE EUROPEAN CONTINENT" IF THE ALLIES WOULD DROP THE WORD " PROGRESSIVELY." AFTER FURTHER DISCUSSION, AGREEMENT WAS REACHED ON THE SENTENCE AS FOLLOWS: " IT WAS AGREED THAT THE GENERAL OBJECTIVE OF THE NEGOTIATIONS WILL BE TO CONTRIBUTE TO A MORE STABLE RELATIONSHIP AND TO THE STRENGTHENING OF PEACE AND SECURITY IN EUROPE."

13. ALLIED REPS THEN TURNED TO THE SENTENCE IN THE SOVIET DRAFT OF MAY 29, " THEY AGREED THAT THE NEGOTIATIONS WOULD FOCUS ON ETC." ALLIED REPS SAID THAT THE SAME DESIGNATION SHOULD BE USED AT THIS POINT AS HAD BEEN TENTATIVELY AGREED FOR PARA 2. DURING LENGTHY DISCUSSION, SOVIETS WITHDREW FROM THE TERM " WOULD FOCUS ON," APPARENTLY BECAUSE THEY FELT THAT IT CONTAINED THE IMPLICATION THAT OTHER SUBJECTS WOULD ALSO FORM PART OF THE NEGOTIATIONS. THEY PROPOSED THAT, INSTEAD, THE VERB IN THE SENTENCE SHOULD BE ONE LIKE " CONSIDER." SINCE THE MAIN OBJECTIVE OF THE SENTENCE FROM ALLIED VIEWPOINT WAS TO AVOID THE IMPRESSION THAT THE AGREED DESIGNATION AT THE SAME TIME REPRESENTED AN EXCLUSIVE AND COMPREHENSIVE DESCRIPTION OF THE AGENDA, ALLIED REPS AGREED TO A SENTENCE WHICH NOW READS, " THEY AGREED THAT DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS, MUTUAL REDUCTION OF FORCES AND ARM-AMENTS AND ASSOCIATED MEASURES IN CENTRAL EUROPE WOULD BE CON-SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 04499 02 OF 03 301551 Z

SIDERED."

14. ALLIED REPS NEXT TURNED TO THE PHRASE IN THE SOVIET DRAFT WHICH READ, " IN VIEW OF THE COMPLEXITY OF THE SUBJECT MATTER, IT WAS CONSIDERED THAT IN THE NEGOTIATIONS, AN UNDERSTANDING SHOULD BE REACHED HOW TO CONDUCT THEM MORE EFFECTIVELY." ALLIED REPS SAID LAST PORTION OF SOVIET PHRASE WAS MEANINGLESS AND SHOULD BE REPLACED WITH THE PHRASE " ON A PHASED PROCESS APPROPRIATE TO THE NATURE OF THE SUBJECT MATTER." SOVIETS OBJECTED STRONGLY TO THE TERM " PHASED." ALLIED REPS PROPOSED " ON AN APPROACH APPROPRIATE TO THE NATURE OF THE SUBJECT MATTER," POINTING OUT THAT THE WORD " APPROACH" HAD BEEN USED IN THE RECENT BREZHNEV/ BRANDT COMMUNIQUE. SOVIETS SAID THEY WOULD NOT WANT TO HAVE THE WORD " APPROACH." ALLIED REPS SAID THE WORD " APPROACH" WAS NEUTRAL AND PROPOSED " ON THE APPROACH WHICH

WILL DEAL MOST EFFECTIVELY WITH THE COMPLEXITY," OR " IN A WAY WHICH TAKES ACCOUNT OF THEIR COMPLEXITY." AFTER A FURTHER HALF-HOUR OF DISCUSSION, IT WAS AGREED TO LEAVE THIS ISSUE UNRESOLVED FOR THE TIME BEING AND TO RETURN TO IT.

15. ALLIED REPS THEN TURNED TO THE " BALANCED" ISSUE, AS SET FORTH IN THEIR POPOSED SENTENCE " IT WAS AGREED THAT POSSIBLE MEASURES AND AGREEMENTS WILL HAVE TO BE BALANCED IN SUCH A WAY THAT THEY WILL AT NO POINT BE TO THE DETRIMENT OF THE SECURITY OF THE STATES CONCERNED." KHLESTOV SAID HE WISHED TO MAKE A CLEAR STATEMENT ON THIS PROPOSAL. THE WORD " BALANCED" EMBODIED A KNOWN WESTERN PHILOSOPHY OF THE FORCE REDUCTION NEGOTIATIONS. THIS PHILOSOPHY WAS UNILATERALLY TO THE DISADVANTAGE OF THE SOVIET UNION AND ITS ALLIES. THE SOVIET UNION AND ITS ALLIES WOULD NOT ACCEPT THIS TERM NOW UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES. IT WOULD BE FOR THE NEGOTIATORS TO DETERMINE WHETHER IT WAS SATISFACTORY THEN. ALLIED REPS POINTED OUT THAT THE PHRASE HAD BEEN USED IN EXACTLY THE SAME GENERAL CONTEXT IN THE MCCLOY/ ZORIN STATEMENT OF SEPT 30, 1961. SOVIET REPS CLAIMED THIS WAS IN A DIFFERENT CONTEXT.

16. ALLIED REPS POINTED OUT THAT THEY HAD BEEN WILLING TO REMOVE THE WORD " BALANCED" FROM THEIR PROPOSAL FOR DESIGNATION OF THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE NEGOTIATIONS. THEY REALIZED THAT THE WORD BALANCED MIGHT HAVE NEGATIVE CONNOTATIONS FOR EASTERN LEADERS. THEY HAD REPEATEDLY POINTED OUT THAT THE WORD WAS
SECRET

PAGE 05 VIENNA 04499 02 OF 03 301551 Z

NEUTRAL AND HAD IN FACT EVEN OFFERED PROPOSED LANGUAGE FOR INCLUSION IN THE COMMUNIQUE WHICH WOULD REPRESENT AN AGREED NEUTRAL DEFINITION OF THE TERM IN THE SENSE THAT IT WOULD MEAN THE APPLICATION TO THE SPECIFIC AGREEMENTS WHICH EMERGED FROM...

SECRET
NMAFVVZCZADP000

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04499 03 OF 03 301603 Z

42
ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-13 ADP-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

INRE-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-02 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10

PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11 ACDA-19 OMB-01 AECE-00 RSR-01

/142 W
----- 077669

O P 301425 Z MAY 73
FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 9044
INFO SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
ALL MBFR CAPITALS PRIORITY 523
AMEMBASSY BELGRADE
USMISSION GENEVA PRIORITY
USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY
USLOSACLANT PRIORITY
USCINCEUR PRIORITY
USDOCOSOUTH PRIORITY
USDEL SALT TWO II PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 3 VIENNA 4499

GENEVA FOR DISTO

USNATO TAKE AS IMMEDIATE

FROM US REP MBFR

THE NEGOTIATIONS OF THE PRINCIPLE OF UNDIMINISHED SECURITY.
ALLIED REPS WERE CONFIDENT THAT EASTERN REPS COULD MAKE
A GOOD CASE IN THEIR CAPITALS FOR THIS REASONABLE VERSION
AND COULD OVERCOME PRESENT OPPOSITION TO THE USE OF THE TERM.

17. KHLESTOV SAID THAT IF HE AT ANY TIME RECOMMENDED USE OF
THIS TERM TO MOSCOW, HE WOULD BE EXECUTED ON THE SPOT. THERE
SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04499 03 OF 03 301603 Z

WAS SIMPLY NO POINT WHATEVER IN THE ALLIED REPS PUSHING
THIS PHRASE. THE SOVIETS WOULD NOT ACCEPT IT UNDER ANY CIR-
CUMSTANCES WHATEVER. AFTER FURTHER PROTRACTED DISCUSSION,
IT WAS DECIDED TO FOOTNOTE THE ISSUE. AT ONE POINT, TIMERBAYEV
EVEN REFUSED TO ACCEPT THE USE OF THE WORD "BALANCED"
IN THE FOOTNOTE, DEMONSTRATING THE INTENSITY OF THE SOVIET
OPPOSITION TO THE USE OF THE TERM.

18. THE SOVIET REPS ALSO OBJECTED TO THE PHRASE "AT NO POINT"
SINCE THEY APPARENTLY CONSIDERED THIS TO IMPLY STAGING OR
PHASING. THEY INSISTED ON THEIR WORKING "IN NO CASE" OR
"IN NO WAY." THIS ISSUE WAS ALSO FOOTNOTED. SOVIETS ALSO ARGUED
AGAINST THE USE OF THE TERM "MEASURES AND AGREEMENTS" IN THIS
SENTENCE, URGING THAT IT SHOULD BE REPLACED BY THE TERM
"ARRANGEMENTS." THEY APPARENTLY FELT THAT THEY HAD USED THE WORD
"MEASURES," WHICH IS UNPOPULAR TO THE SOVIETS, TOO FREQUENTLY
AND WANTED TO REPLACE IT BY SOME MORE GENERAL TERM.
ALLIED REPS SAID THEY WOULD TAKE THIS POINT UNDER ADVISEMENT.
THE RESULTING SENTENCE READS AS FOLLOWS: "IT WAS ALSO AGREED
THAT SPECIFIC BRACKETS ARRANGEMENTS BRACKETS WILL HAVE TO
BE IN SUCH A WAY THAT THEY WILL..... BE TO THE DETRIMENT
OF THE SECURITY OF ANY OF THE PARTIES."

19. THERE WAS A BRIEF DISCUSSION OF THE PHRASE IN THE SOVIET PROPOSAL " THIS EXCHANGE OF VIEWS ON THE AGENDA WILL GREATLY FACILITATE THE WORK OF THE FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS." SOVIETS AGREED TO CHANGE THE PHRASE " THE AGENDA" TO " AN AGENDA" ACCEPTING THE ALLIED REASONING THAT THERE WAS NO ARTICLE IN RUSSIAN IN ANY EVENT AND THAT THE ENGLISH CONNOTATION OF " THE" AGENDA WOULD BE THAT A SPECIFIC AGENDA HAD BEEN AGREED. SOVIETS ANNOUNCED THAT THEY WISHED TO CONSIDER DROPPING THIS SENTENCE.

20. THERE WAS LENGTHY DISCUSSION OF THE ALLIED PROPOSAL FOR INCLUSION OF A SENTENCE WHICH STATED, " IT WAS DECIDED THAT EACH OF THOSE STATES WHICH WILL MAKE THE NECESSARY DECISIONS WILL HAVE THE RIGHT TO INTRODUCE INTO THE NEGOTIATIONS ANY TOPIC RELEVANT TO THE SUBJECT MATTER." IT WAS AGREED THAT THE PHRASE " INTRODUCE FOR NEGOTIATIONS" WOULD BE MORE CLEAR THAN THE PHRASE " INTRODUCE INTO THE NEGOTIATIONS." AFTER EXTENSIVE DISCUSSION OF THIS PHRASE, US REP ASKED
SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04499 03 OF 03 301603 Z

KHLESTOV POINT BLANK WHETHER THE SOVIET UNDERSTANDING OF THIS PHRASE WAS THAT SUCH TOPICS WOULD BE DECIDED ON THEIR INTRINSIC MERITS WITHOUT EFFORTS TO PREVENT THEIR CONSIDERATION ON PROCEDURAL GROUNDS. KHLESTOV REPLIES THAT THIS PHRASE MEANT IN HIS INTERPRETATION THAT THERE WAS NO BASIS TO PREVENT ON PROCEDURAL GROUNDS CONSIDERATION OF ANY TOPIC INTRODUCED INTO THE NEGOTIATIONS. SUCH QUESTIONS WOULD HAVE TO BE DECIDED ON THEIR SUBSTANTIVE MERITS.

21. DURING FURTHER DISCUSSION OF THIS SENTENCE, THE SOVIETS INDICATED THAT THEY AGREED IN SUBSTANCE WITH THE ALLIED VIEW THAT ONLY DIRECT PARTICIPANTS HAD THE RIGHT TO RAISE TOPICS FOR NEGOTIATION AS DISTINGUISHED FROM RAISING TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION. THEY WOULD BE WILLING TO PRESENT THE ALLIED VIEWS ON THIS POINT TO THEIR COLLEAGUES, BUT WERE UNWILLING TO ADOPT SPECIFIC LANGUAGE UNTIL THEY HAD DONE SO. THE OUTCOME OF THE DISCUSSION ON THIS POINT WAS THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE: " IT WAS (ALSO) DECIDED THAT IN THE COURSE OF THE NEGOTIATIONS, ANY TOPIC RELEVANT TO THE SUBJECT MATTER MAY BE INTRODUCED FOR NEGOTIATION BRACKETS BY ANY OF THOSE STATES WHICH WILL TAKE THE NECESSARY DECISIONS. BRACKETS " THE WORD " ALSO" BRACKETED FOR PURELY STYLISTIC REASONS AND ITS INCLUSION WAS DEPENDENT ON THE AGREED POSITION OF THE SENTENCE IN THE TEXT.

22. DISCUSSION THEN TURNED TO THE SOVIET PROPOSAL FOR ESTABLISHING A WORKING BODY DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS. SOVIET REPS MADE CLEAR THAT THEY HAD IN MIND ESTABLISHING A WORKING BODY COMPOSED ONLY OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. ALLIED REPS SAID THEY CONSIDERED SUCH A SENTENCE SUPERFLUOUS, BUT IF THE SOVIETS ATTACHED GREAT WEIGHT TO IT, THEY MIGHT BE WILLING TO CONSIDER

IT BUT ONLY IF IT WERE PUT IN THE PLURAL. THERE COULD BE NO
THOUGHT OF SETTING UP A SINGLE WORKING BODY ON THE SOVIET MODEL.
IN FURTHER DISCUSSION TENTATIVE AGREEMENT WAS REACHED
ON THE PHRASE, " DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS THE QUESTION OF
ESTABLISHING WORKING BODIES OR WORKING GROUPS WILL BE CONSIDERED."

23. IT WAS AGREED TO HAVE A FURTHER SESSION ON THE AFTERNOON
OF MAY 30.

24. NOTE: FOOTNOTE 7 C OF TEXT FORWARDED IN VIENNA 4471
SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 04499 03 OF 03 301603 Z

SHOULD READ : " CONSIDERED (EASTERN)" NOT REPEAT NOT " WESTERN."
THE WORD IS OBVIOUSLY AN EASTERN PROPOSAL.
HUMES

SECRET
NMAFVVZCZ
<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 10 MAY 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 30 MAY 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973VIENNA04499
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730560/abqcelmf.tel
Line Count: 451
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION MBF
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 9
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags: ANOMALY
Review Date: 07 SEP 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <07-Sep-2001 by cunninfx>; APPROVED <29-Oct-2001 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: <DBA CORRECTED> mcm 980310
Subject: MBFR: DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET AND CZECHOSLOVAK REPS, MAY 29, 1973
TAGS: PARM
To: STATE INFO SECDEF
MBFR CAPTALS
GENEVA
USNMR SHAPE
PRIORITY
USCINCEUR
USDOCOSOUTH

SALT TWO
BELGRADE

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005